REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed the application in light of the Office Action dated June 7, 2007. Claims 1-23 are pending. Claims 1, 10, 18, and 23 have been amended. New matter has not been added with the amendments to the claims. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application in accordance with the following remarks.

Section 112 Rejections

Claims 1-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. The Office Action states that "previous accessed items" is not clearly described in the specification. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Applicant's Specification describes analyzing database access statements that were issued for an application during use to determine previous accessed items and types of access for the application at least on page 4, lines 4-12, page 6, lines 4-20, and page 8, lines 12-27.

Section 103 Rejections

Claims 1, 3-10, 12-20, and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,182,142 to Win et al. ("Win") in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0091798 to Joshi et al. ("Joshi"). Applicant respectfully disagrees that the claims are unpatentable over the cited patent literature.

Claim 1 recites "developing a role for the application based on the previous accessed items and types of access for the application, wherein when the application is in use by a user, the developed role for the application allows the user database access." Neither the Win nor Joshi references teach at least this feature.

Win teaches controlling access to one or more information resources by identifying a subset of resources that the user is authorized to access based on one or more roles that are stored in association with user identifying information (Win, column 2, lines 28-33). Additionally, the roles in Win are developed by listing functions or capacities in which a person might act when they access resources and their functional group, department, or organizational unit (Win,

column 14, lines 11-15). Thus, Win fails to teach developing a role for an application, much less developing a role based on previously accessed items and types of access.

Joshi also fails to teach "developing a role for an application based on previous accessed items and types of access for an application, wherein when an application is in use by a user, a developed role for an application allows a user database access." Instead, Joshi discloses an access system that provides data to resources available on a network (Joshi, paragraph 0011). In particular, Joshi teaches that upon authentication or authorization, login information for a particular user and a particular application can be added to the HTTP request as header variables (Joshi, paragraph 0016). A downstream application can then search the described header variable and automatically attempt to authorize the user (Joshi, paragraph 0016). Thus, the Joshi reference teaches adding login information for a user to HTTP requests from the user to allow automatic authorization of the user, as opposed to anything about developing a role, much less developing a role for an application based on previous accessed items and types of access for an application.

The Examiner does find that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate Joshi's teachings into the system of Win and that the combination teaches developing a role for an application based on previous accessed items and types of access for an application. Bus as just discussed, neither Win nor Joshi teaches the recited limitations. Thus, their combination also surely fails to teach the limitations.

For instance, the Win reference teaches defining roles based on functions users have in an organization (Win, column 14, lines 6-11), and that, storing the roles, and based on the stored roles associated with a user, identifying a subset of resources that the user is authorized to access" (Win, column 2, lines 31-34) (emphasis added). Similarly, Joshi teaches after authentication based on a user's identity profile access to resources is authorized (Joshi, paragraph 0012). But combining Win and Joshi results in authorizing a user, accessing a system, and providing access using permissions and/or headers.

Thus, the combination of Win and Joshi fails to teach developing a role for an application based on previous accessed items and types of access for an application. Accordingly, claim 1 and its dependent claims are allowable over the cited art.

Claims 2-9 depend from claim 1 and, hence, contain all of its limitations, which have already been shown to be allowable over Win. Claims 2-9 also contain additional limitations not taught by Win.

For example, claim 5 recites "wherein developing a role comprises determining permissions for the application based on the determined accessed items and types of access." But Win and Joshi do not teach that developing a role comprises determining permissions for an application based on determined accessed items and types of access. Instead, Win teaches granting access to a resource only when the roles associated with the user satisfy the access rule (Win, column 3, lines 40-41). That is, Win teaches granting access to resources based on roles rather than developing a role. Joshi fails to rectify the deficiencies of Win. Accordingly, claim 5 is further allowable over Win and Joshi.

As another example, claim 9 recites "detecting an end of the application session; and if an end of the application session is detected, disabling the assigned role for the user." The Win and the Joshi reference fail to teach at least this feature of the claim. Instead, the Win reference teaches disabling a user's account for a pre-determined period of time if a user exceeds a number of consecutive unsuccessful logins attempts (Win, column 10, lines 39-45). Joshi fails to rectify the deficiencies of Win. Accordingly, claim 9 is further allowable over Win and Joshi.

Independent claims 10 and 18 recite limitations similar to that of claim 1. In particular, Claim 10 recites developing a role for the application based on the previous accessed items and types of access for the application. Claim 18 recites developing a role for the application based on the previously issued database access statements for the application, wherein when the application is in use by a user, the developed role for the application allows a user database access. Accordingly, for reasons stated above in connection with claims 1, 5, and 9, claims 10 and 18 and their corresponding dependent claims are also allowable over Win and Joshi.

Independent claim 23 recites limitations similar to that of claim 1. In particular, the claim recites determining permissions for the application based on the previous accessed items and types of access for the application and developing a role for the application based on the determined permissions. Accordingly, for reasons stated above in connection with claims 1, 5, and 9, claim 23 is also allowable over Win and Joshi.

Claims 2, 11, 21, and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Win in view of Joshi and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,665,664 to Paulley et al. ("Paulley"). Applicant respectfully disagrees that the claims are unpatentable over the cited patent literature.

Claim 2 depends on claim 1 which recites "developing a role for the application based on the previous accessed items and types of access for the application, wherein when the application is in use by a user, the developed role for the application allows the user database access". For at least the reasons previously mentioned, Win and Joshi do not teach at least this feature of the claims. Paulley fails to rectify the deficiencies of Win and Joshi. Accordingly, claim 1 and its dependent claims are allowable over the patent literature.

In addition, claim 2 recites "capturing the database access statements; normalizing the database access statements; and eliminating redundancies in the database access statements." Win and Joshi do not teach capturing, normalizing, and/or eliminating redundancies in database access statements (Office Action, page 10). Paulley also fails to teach eliminating redundancies in database access statement. Instead, the cited portions of Paulley teach checking each segment to ensure that each segment contains at least a minimum number of repeated references to the same columns or tables before attempting to normalize a segment (column 14, lines 46-51). Accordingly, claim 2 is further allowable over Win, Joshi, and Paulley.

Claims 11 and 21 depend on claims 10 and 18, respectively. Independent claims 10 and 18 recite limitations similar to that of claim 1. In particular, Claim 10 recites developing a role for the application based on the previous accessed items and types of access for the application.

Claim 18 recites developing a role for the application based on the previously issued database access statements for the application, wherein when the application is in use by a user, the developed role for the application allows a user database access. Accordingly, for reasons stated above in connection with claims 1 and 2, claims 10 and 18 and their corresponding dependent claims are also allowable over the cited patent literature.

Independent claim 23 recites limitations similar to that of claim 1. In particular, the claim recites determining permissions for the application based on the previous accessed items and types of access for the application and developing a role for the application based on the determined permissions. Accordingly, for reasons stated above in connection with claims 1 and 2, claim 23 is also allowable over the cited patent literature.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

In view of the above, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully submits that the Application is in condition for allowance, and requests such a Notice. If the present Application is not allowed and/or if one or more of the rejections is maintained or made final, Applicants hereby request a telephone conference with the Examiner and further requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney to schedule a telephone conference.

No fees are believed to be due at this time. If any extension of time is required, Applicant hereby requests the appropriate extension of time. Please apply any other charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 05-0765.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 7, 2007

/Elizabeth Philip Dahm/
Elizabeth Philip Dahm
Reg. No. 51,352

PTO Customer No. 26230
Fish & Richardson P.C.
1717 Main Street
Suite 5000
Dallas, Texas 75201
Telephone: (214) 760-6119
Facsimile: (214) 747-2091